



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

worthy of such a blessing. We think the cause of religious freedom among the Irish in America owes much to the exertions of *The Irish Evangelist*, which we have been reading for upwards of twelve months, and it would give us sincere pleasure to hear that some of our wealthier readers in England or Ireland would assist the good work in which it is engaged, by sending some pecuniary assistance to the editor and proprietor, Mr. John Hurley, No. 265, Bowery, New York, to enable him to distribute his paper gratuitously to our countrymen in America who are anxious to read and think for themselves. We agree with Mr. Hurley, that it requires very different reading from the ordinary tract to meet the wants of inquiring Roman Catholics; and while he conducts his journal in the spirit of candid inquiry and fair reasoning, he may feel secure of our cordial sympathy and co-operation.*

Correspondence.

INFALLIBILITY OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—The following thoughts suggested themselves to the writer on reading Mr. Rourke's letter, in your last number.

Mr. Rourke "discovers the infallibility of the Church in the positive and unequivocal promises of our Lord Jesus Christ;" but Mr. Rourke overlooks the fact, repeatedly proved in Scripture, that God's promises are *contingent*, and require that man shall faithfully and honestly endeavour to fulfil his part, no other infallible guides than God's Word and God's Spirit being anywhere revealed. Take, for instance, the call of Moses and Aaron—"I will be with thy mouth and with his mouth, and *will teach you what ye shall do.*"—Exod. iv. 15. Immediately after this Moses and Aaron assembled the people, informed them of the commission they had received, and "*did signs in the sight of the people, and the people believed.*"—Exod. iv. 29-31. Here, if ever, we might have acknowledged an infallible guide; yet, within a few short weeks, at the request of the people, Aaron takes the lead in a gross act of idolatry.—Exod. xxxii. 1-6. The people were weary of waiting upon God according to his own word, and desired something more tangible and exciting, and induced him, who should have restrained them, to join in their sin. Just so with the Church of Rome.

The Scriptures were a sufficient guide (infallible in themselves, still to be interpreted by fallible men), but the people liked not the spirituality of the simple faith: they required something more externally attractive, and their guides, seeing this disposition—seeing, also, the wealth and power that would accrue to themselves from a more gorgeous ritual—did as Aaron had done, forgot God, and reared up a golden idol in his place.

Again, we are told (Deut. ix. 20), that "the Lord was very angry with Aaron to have destroyed him." He who was supernaturally called to a special mission, and promised Divine guidance in word and deed, was well nigh destroyed at its very commencement (and only saved by the prayer of another), because he was not faithful in that committed to him. Indeed, God himself declares that his promises are conditional.—"At what instant I shall speak concerning a kingdom to build and to plant it, if it do evil in my sight, that it obey not my voice, then I will repent of the good wherewith I said I would benefit them."—Jer. xviii. 9, 10.

Let Mr. Rourke refer to the apocalyptic Churches, founded by the Apostles and apostolic men, and at the period when the Spirit addressed them under the presidency of the Apostle John, and he will see that the general promises of Christ do not secure infallibility to any Church, and that corporate bodies, even when under the rule of inspired heads, are not infallible. The Church of Ephesus had fallen, and was warned to repent or to be cut off. The Church at Ephesus was planted by St. Paul, who resided there "three years," earnestly preaching the truth.—Acts xx. 31. He appointed his own successor to watch over it, with whom he was in frequent communication; and shortly before his death he wrote his celebrated Epistle to them, in which he declares that they are "fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God, built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief cornerstone." Here, then, was a Church which must have participation in all Christ's promises, yet even during the life of the beloved disciple who dwelt with her she had fallen; therefore the promises of Christ, together with the inspection of its rulers, do not assure infallibility to any Church. Still Christ's promises shall never fail—he is ever with his Church militant on earth, and will so continue till, triumphant in heaven, it beholds His glory.

Another argument against the pretension to infallibility is supplied by St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans. Speaking of the Jews, he says—"Well, because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith; be not high-minded, but fear; for if God spared not the

natural branches, take heed lest he spare not thee; behold, therefore, the goodness and severity of God: on them which fell, severity; but toward thee, goodness, *if thou continue in his goodness, otherwise thou also shalt be cut off.*" This language, addressed by an inspired Apostle to the very Church of Rome, ought to have warned her against all assumption of high-sounding titles, and especially against that pretension to infallibility which belongs not to anything of earth, for if infallible, it must "*continue in the goodness of God,*" and then there could be no alternative of "*cutting off.*" Mr. Rourke asserts that all God's works are perfect—not absolutely so; they have all the elements of perfection, but being committed to imperfect agents they fall short of the mark. God had built up the Jewish nation and the Jewish Church; but both the civil and ecclesiastical state fell so far short of perfection that God frequently expresses His displeasure against them, and thus speaks to Jeremiah—"Behold, that which I have built I will break down, and that which I have planted I will pluck up, even this whole land." The general assertion, therefore, that all God's works are perfect after they come into the hands of man, is erroneous; but, if it were true, what can the Church of Rome plead more than Israel and Judah that infallibility should be hers?

Your obedient servant,
BEDALE.

ON PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD AND THE BURIAL SERVICE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—Since you have so peremptorily decided (C. L., Vol. ii., No. 21., page 106), that the question of purgatory is settled, as far as the Fathers of the first three centuries are concerned, it may appear preposterous in me again to recur to a subject thus summarily disposed of, and particularly so, as the references supplied by *Diego* are intended as the seal of your adjudication; but as these references are rather indefinite in application, and convey no specific information, I shall, in the first place, and I presume not "unreasonably," request to be informed, does St. Augustine mean by saying, "The Church hath rejected Origen," that the Church hath rejected all the writings of Origen? Secondly, I find Origen in different parts of his writings maintaining the following points of Catholic doctrine—namely, the *real presence* in the Eucharist, confession to a priest, invocation of angels and saints, the primacy of St. Peter, celibacy of the clergy, a release from prison when the utmost suffering is paid, the Church alone the interpreter of Holy Scripture, authority of the Church—with other points of doctrine believed and taught by the Catholic Church of the present day: In this respect, then, I also require a decided reply as to whether any of the above-mentioned points, and, if so, which of them were condemned by the fifth Ecumenical Council? As I am not here treating controversially on these subjects, having only alluded to them for sake of illustration, I have not considered it necessary to refer to them particularly; this I can do should I come to discuss them. In noticing your remarks on the next portion of my letter I have not to contend with anything in the shape of an argument: you cautiously avoid the question at issue. To the argument which I proposed relative to the Fathers of the fourth century, and to which I now again call your attention, you only reply by frivolous objections, unfounded assumptions, or by endeavouring to represent me arguing "*unconsciously*," from the present in support of the primitive doctrine of the Church. I have selected an argument at once rigorous and conclusive, and strictly limited to one particular period; and the force of your objections to the principles on which I have established this argument vanishes on a candid examination of the passages which I cited from these Fathers, all of whom refer, either directly or by implication, to 1 Cor. iii., 12, 13, 14, &c., and to other corroborating texts of Scripture, and in them they can find the doctrine of a future purgation and cleansing by fire; a punishing, yet saving fire, plainly and unmistakeably established. Now, let me suppose a proposition illogically stated; a principle injudiciously adopted, or even arbitrarily assumed; can such informality justify you in withholding your arguments against the doctrine of purgatory? Is it because I argue the question on principles different from yours that you put your candle under a bushel, instead of dispelling what you call the superstitious darkness of your Catholic brethren? I am a Christian by profession and a Catholic by conviction; convince me that I am wrong and I will subscribe to your doctrine, and write my name Protestant.

Mr. Thordlike says of the faithful departed, "What hinders them to receive comfort, refreshment, rest, peace, and light to sustain them in the expectation of their trial, and the anxieties they are to pass through during the time of it?" And though there be hopes for those that are solicitous to live and die good Christians that they are in no such suspense, but within the bounds of the heavenly Jerusalem; yet because their condition is uncertain, and while there is hope of the better, there is also fear of the worse; therefore, the Church hath always assisted them with the prayers of the living, both for their speedy trial and easy absolution, and discharge with glory before God."—(*Just Weights and Measures*, chap. xvi. p. 107.)

In this extract we have vividly set forth the belief of the Church respecting the trial of Christian souls after death, the anxieties they suffer during their trial, the practice of

the Church in assisting them, &c., and their *absolution* and *discharge*—or, if you will, a pardon of their sins; and that in a third place, or before they were admitted within the heavenly Jerusalem; whilst, on the contrary, the burial office in the Protestant ritual excludes the idea of any such belief. It is imperative that this office be read over all (save those excepted by the rubric), and a confident hope is expressed of the salvation of all that are buried, though they may have died in a notorious state of impenitence, without any appearance or profession of reconciliation to God; they may, in fact, have lived most notoriously infamous lives—have been Deists or Atheists, and continued so to their last moments; and not having been formally excommunicated, it is presumed of each such person in the burial office (which cannot be refused him) being read over his remains, that he is within the bounds of the heavenly Jerusalem; "that when we depart this life we may rest in him, as our hope is, *this our brother doth*," is the burden of the prayer. Hence, it is evident that the Protestant doctrine of prayers for the dead is utterly different from that of the early Church, which prayed only for those who died in the sincere profession of the Catholic faith; as also from the doctrine of the Catholic Church of the present day, which refuses to pray for incorrigible, impenitent sinners. It is useless, in an affair of such importance, and when the evidence is so decidedly against you, to endeavour, by any evasive gloss, to ignore the fact, that in this *dogma* of Protestant doctrine there must be something radically wrong; and how this can be tolerated in a Church which claims to itself the exclusive privilege of being truly Evangelical, you will be called upon to explain. I ask you, was the Church founded by the Apostles so utterly defective in any of its constituent principles? I answer emphatically—No. You may reply, that the connection of your Church with the State has authorized the practice; but can that be any justification of the fact? Can it be consistent with rational charity that, on such an awful occasion, this office, in the name of religion, should be read most solemnly over the remains of a notorious impugner of religion; a debauched and abandoned libertine, or a professed unbeliever, and a hope expressed that he is with God; and that we are to be his future companions in glory? No prayer is offered to entreat comfort, refreshment, &c., to sustain him during his trial to obtain his absolution and discharge from his sins; but the presumptuous hope is expressed that he is with God.

That it may appear how just the foregoing observations are, I shall quote the opinions of some learned Divines of the Protestant Church on this same subject:—

"It must be owned, and it is too plain to be denied, that in such cases as you mention, of men cut off in the midst of notorious sins, drunkenness, adultery, murder, &c., this office is wholly improper; and sure, we need not doubt but that at length some regard will be had to the repeated desires of many of the best defenders of the Church, and this ground of objection against it be wholly removed." (Rens. of Conformity, page 62—By the Bishop of Winchester.)

Here is the evil admitted; also the inability of the Church to supply a remedy. Archbishop Tillotson says, "Was the ancient discipline of the Church in any degree put in practice now, in what shoals and herds would men be driven out of the communion of the Church?" (Vol. I., Serm. 67.) To the same purpose we have Dr. Wheatley (arguing the cases of *ipso facto* excommunications, p. 494), declaring "the consequence would be, we presume, that this office (the Burial Office) would comparatively be but seldom read."

This brings me to consider next your alleged charge against Catholics with respect to their ignorance of the first principles of Protestants; a charge which I think the foregoing observations have rendered wholly groundless. Requesting you will show how the question of prayers for the dead, as I have stated, to be the practice of the Protestant Church, can be supported by Scripture authority,

I have the honour to remain,

Sir, yours in sincere Christian charity,

EDMOND POWER.

As Mr. Power finds it so hard to understand what is meant by the assertion that "the Church hath rejected Origen," we must endeavour to throw a little light on the subject by a parallel case. He will admit, we suppose, that the Church of Rome has rejected Martin Luther. Does this mean that the Church of Rome rejects every doctrine that Martin Luther believed, and that she does not teach the doctrines of the Incarnation or the Trinity, because those truths were acknowledged by Luther? Surely not. Or again, does it mean that the Church of Rome only rejects those of Luther's opinions which she specially names, and that on every other point we may be quite sure that Luther and she perfectly agree? Not that either. But the Church of Rome having rejected Martin Luther, is no longer concerned what truths he may hold, or what falsehoods he may propound; he cannot be understood as having a right to represent her sentiments. Suppose now that a Protestant were to assert that the Church of Rome held that the moon was made of green cheese, and that the angels smoke tobacco, and should give as a proof his assertion that those propositions were to be found somewhere in the works of Martin Luther, what would Mr. Power reply? He would say, unless you give me references I cannot be expected to believe on your bare word that Luther did believe these strange propositions; but even if he did, it is nothing

* We are sorry to find the C. L. has not reached Mr. Hurley regularly. We are assured by our publisher that it has been regularly forwarded, as published, monthly.

to me, the Church of Rome is not answerable for him. And just so with the list of doctrines which Mr. Power asks us to believe are to be found somewhere or other in the works of Origen. Whether Origen held these doctrines or no can only be decided by quotations *with references* from the works of Origen. But when we have settled this question we shall be no nearer to knowing what the Church believed in Origen's day, for no church is answerable for the opinions of those whom she rejects as heretics.

Mr. Power next gives an extract from Mr. Thorndike's writings, for what purpose we cannot at all conceive. We readily admit that this extract is more like purgatory than anything we can find in the writings of the Fathers of the first three centuries. If there had been anything in their writings so much to his purpose, we should have had it flung in our teeth at least once a month. Epiphanius, when asked why he prays for the dead, does not give at all so clear an account. But after all, did Mr. Thorndike believe in Purgatory? When Mr. Power says that he "vividly sets forth the belief of the Church," is he aware that Mr. Thorndike notoriously did not hold the belief of his Church on this subject. We have, in fact, here an example how dangerous a thing it is to quote from a book without reading it. The passage quoted by Mr. Power is taken from a place where Mr. Thorndike is arguing that the early Fathers did not believe in Purgatory! and contains his explanation why, nevertheless, they did pray to the dead.

A witness in a court of justice who swore that he perfectly knew Job Tomkins, and that he saw him commit a murder, when asked to point him out, put his rod on the head of the attorney on the other side. Mr. Power's evidence is just as valuable when he says that he finds Purgatory in the writings of the Fathers; for wherever he finds prayers for the dead, he fancies he sees Purgatory; and he is just as successful in finding Purgatory in the writings of Mr. Thorndike and Mr. Johnson as in those of Epiphanius and Augustine.

Lastly, Mr. Power contrasts the practice of the Church of England, which, in its burial service, expresses a hope that those whom she commits to the grave rest in Christ, with that of the Church of Rome, which "refuses to pray for incorrigible, impenitent sinners." Now, we believe that in this respect there is no material difference between the two Churches. We may as well say that the Church of England does not read the burial service over "incorrigible, impenitent sinners." But, then, how are we to know that a sinner died incorrigible or impenitent? We confess, in our experience, we never heard of any priest refusing money when asked to pray for one who died in his communion. We have never heard of any priest saying, "My good man, I cannot take your money; I fear it is a bad case; it would be only robbing you to take money for masses for such a reprobate as your uncle." We believe that, on the contrary, the greater the sinner, the more money and the more prayers, he would maintain, were necessary for his repose. And we do not think that the priest would be very much to blame. If we could be quite sure that any particular man who died was gone to hell, then the Church of England, we suppose, would not read the burial service over him. But if we cannot know this, it is only charitable to hope for the best; and, it seems in the vast majority of cases, at least, impossible that we should know it. *Post-mortem* examinations of the body may be sometimes needful for the good of the survivors; but how *post-mortem* examinations of men's souls could be held before interring their bodies, we are at a loss to conceive.

CHURCH VISIBLE AND INVISIBLE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

Carlow, 30th November, 1853.

SIR—Of all subjects of discussion that man is interested in, that of religion is the most momentous, and deserves the calmest and sincerest investigation that the mind of man is capable of giving to it, in which I know you will concur. Now, I beg leave to say that your remarks, or rather the answer you gave to my letter on the "Church Visible and Invisible," has not satisfied me. The difficulty I placed Luther in, or rather the difficulty he placed himself in, reminds you of a famous saying about a famous case in the ancient Church—all the world against Athanasius, and Athanasius against all the world. It was a famous case, no doubt; but the saying was not. It might be better put, and with greater truth—"All the Arians against Athanasius, and Athanasius against all the Arians." Yet you cannot find a parallel case between Luther and Athanasius, any way you take it. Here you have the Council of Nice and Athanasius against Arius, and Arius and his cabals against Athanasius and the Council of Nice. You will say, after all, Athanasius was deposed and sent into banishment; very true, but the charges that caused his deposition were not those of belief as regards the Trinity, as you say, but of crimes that I know you will fairly acquit him, as church history tells us he was found innocent of all crimes of faith and morals, in the Councils of Alexandria, Rome, and Sardica. You say that this question about Luther is, in fact, no difficulty at all to you, and that he was no member of the Church of England or Ireland, nor was that Church founded by him, nor consist of his followers. Now, I confess I cannot understand this statement, so opposed to all history on the matter. Before

Luther changed his views or opinions he was a member of the Church of England and Ireland, inasmuch as he was a member of the Catholic Church, and as the Church of England and Ireland were a part of that great whole, the universal Church. We deem those who profess Arianism to be the followers of Arius, no matter to what country they belong; and so of England and Ireland. Though Luther never put his foot there, you say "your correspondent will agree with us, that there was a Church in England before the Reformation"; and I ask, was it Luther, as it now is—is it now Catholic, as it then was? You say that that very Church rejected errors that she formerly held. Were not those the very errors that Luther opposed; and those errors the then universal Church held in common, and that the *universal Church now holds unanimous*—errors, as you call them, but, thank God, those errors, falsely so called, have the consent of hundreds of millions of human souls—those that are gone before, and those that are, which can claim, and justly too, more intellect, more deep research, more solid piety, amongst them than all the world beside. This may appear to many narrow-minded individuals a sweeping assertion; but what of numbers, you will say, if they are in error. Very true—"to the law and to the testimony." Well, then, let us go and see are those so called errors to be found therein, and were they condemned thereby. Before I go farther I think it but fair to remark, if a Scripture text is to be found for any article of belief, it ought to stand; and, to be refuted, a stronger and plainer text of Scripture must be found to do so; and if any practice in Church discipline or belief, founded on apostolic tradition, for which we have Scripture to prove the reasonableness thereof, must stand until condemned by a warrant of Scripture. Christ's commission to his apostles will alone establish the infallibility of his Church. "All power is given to me in heaven and in earth, going therefore teach all nations, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and behold I am with you all days even to the consummation of the world"—Matt. 28. I will build my Church upon a rock. The gates of hell shall not prevail against her. She is the pillar and ground of truth. My Holy Spirit will teach her all truth for ever. If the above texts will not prove infallibility, what will they go to prove? what purport were they written for? Their plain, obvious sense proclaims the infallibility of God's Church. The Church, the spouse of Christ, loved by him, and presented her to himself, without spot or wrinkle; holy, without blemish, as Paul asserts; then, as a natural inference, that Church which Christ has sanctified with his blessing, in the above words of St. Paul, must be infallible, otherwise she cannot remain holy and without blemish with regard to her teaching. When Paul says—obey your prelates, for they watch, as being to render an account for your souls, are we to slight that injunction, by allowing our minds to be driven about by every wind of doctrine that private interpretation of Scripture is sure to lead us? Take heed to yourselves, says the same Paul, and to your whole flocks, wherein the *Holy Ghost* has placed you bishops, to rule the Church of God. Now, if those bishops of God's Church were to lead their flocks into the quagmires and morasses of idolatry, by becoming the ignis fatuus thereof, would God, in charity's name, subject the sheep of his pasture to be led by them? How are we to know the true interpretation of Scripture but by an infallible judge? I will wait to see what Philalethes says of Berengarius.

I am, dear sir, yours respectfully,

A ROMAN CATHOLIC.

Our correspondent, not being satisfied with our answer to his last letter, we must now try and make it more satisfactory. He says we cannot find a parallel case between Luther and Athanasius, for, in that case, it was "the Council of Nice and Athanasius against Arius, and Arius and his cabals against Athanasius and the Council of Nice." In this our correspondent seems to think that the saying which we quoted—"all the world against Athanasius, and Athanasius against all the world"—was meant to apply to the time of the Council of Nice; but in this he is mistaken: it was applied to the state of things which existed a quarter of a century later, when the Arians were making attempts, which for a time seemed to be wholly successful, to make the whole Church Arian. During that quarter of a century the Arians had been making every effort, and in the year 359, the emperor ordered a general council to assemble to settle the question over again: the eastern bishops to assemble at Seleucia, and the western at Ariminum. The bishops assembled were, 160 at Seleucia, and 400 at Ariminum, 560 in all; being *fourteen times as many* as sat in the earlier sessions of the Council of Trent, and nearly three times as many as ever sat together in the Council of Trent. The question between the Arians and the Council of Nice was, whether Christ be "consubstantial" with the Father (that is, "of the same substance"). At both Seleucia and Ariminum, the bishops passed decrees that this word, "consubstantial," should henceforth be left out of the creed of the Catholic Church, thereby surrendering what the Arians demanded.

And this was not only decreed by the Councils but confirmed by the Pope. Pope Liberius, it is true, at first refused to agree to it; but, being sent into banishment, in order to obtain his return to Rome, he wrote a letter renouncing the faith of Athanasius and the Council of Nice, and declaring his agreement with the eastern bishops, who were notoriously Arians. Here are the words of his letter

to the oriental bishops—"I do not defend Athanasius.... when I knew that you had *justly condemned him*, since it was *pleasing to God*. I afterwards *supplied my consent to your sentence*; and, in addition, I gave letters to be brought to the Emperor Constantius, by our brother Fortunatianus, concerning him (Athanasius) by name, that is, concerning his condemnation. Therefore, Athanasius being removed, all your decrees concerning whom *will be revered by me, together with the apostolic see*, I say that I have peace and unity with all of you, and with all the eastern bishops, and through all the provinces.*

Then it was that Athanasius (as well became his name, which means "the undying one") stood forth alone in defence of the Nicene faith.

Of this it is that St. Vincent Lirinensis says, "when the poison of the Arians had contaminated, not merely a small portion, but almost the whole world, so that nearly all the Latin bishops† being deceived, partly by force, partly by fraud, a sort of darkness fell over the minds of men as to what was to be especially followed in circumstances of such great confusion; then whoever was a true lover and worshipper of Christ, by preferring the ancient faith to the novel perfidy, escaped the defilement of that contagion" (Commentatorium, c. 4).

All this is no "difficulty" to us, for we believe that even when a Pope and a General Council of 560 Bishops fell, Christ had still a true Church; but if, as the Roman Catholic Bishop Milner says (End of Controversy, part II., letter 30), all Roman Catholics agree that a General Council, confirmed by the Pope, must be infallible, as representing the Universal Church—we do not see how Roman Catholics can get over this difficulty. It is certainly a greater difficulty *to them*, than it is *to us*, to tell where the visible Church was when Luther began to teach. Does our correspondent get out of this difficulty about Athanasius by saying that, though the whole Church, at the time in question, was against him, yet he had the Church of former times in his favour? Well, supposing that Luther had stood alone, and that we follow him, we should say exactly the same, that we have the Church in the time of the Council of Nice on our side. Can that defence ever lose its force by lapse of time?

But we deny that Luther stood alone, or that we follow him. Athanasius, though for a long time he seemed to stand alone, as respected public controversy and teaching, still had many on his side. So had Luther. To name no more, Vatablus, whose notes on the Bible we shall notice in another place, was a contemporary of Luther. He, like many others, laboured to restore the religion of the Bible.

But, as we said in our last answer to our correspondent, we are no followers of Luther. We agree with him only so far as he followed the early Church, and we do not follow him at all. Our correspondent says he "cannot understand this statement, so opposed to all history on the matter." Our correspondent does not tell us *what* history, and we know of none to which it is opposed. But suppose it were, we have learned to know that "history" often tells lies; and we are free to appeal from "history" to *historical facts*. Is it a fact that the English Church has followed Luther? Were not the corporal presence of Christ in the Eucharist, and the use of images, two main questions of the Reformation? and, is it not notorious that from the commencement of the Reformation up to this day, the English Church has wholly differed from Luther on these two great points? Luther and his followers, to this day, hold the use of images, and the doctrine of consubstantiation, which differs but little from transubstantiation, both of which the Church of England and Ireland has *always* rejected ever since the Reformation. Will he tell us now that we are followers of Luther? We tell him that we follow the Word of God, and the early Church which followed it. We follow Luther not at all; and we agree with him only so far as he also followed that which we follow.

And if our correspondent supposes that Roman Catholics in England and Ireland are the Church which subsisted in England and Ireland before the Reformation, we are willing to meet him on that ground. Suppose we could go back to England and Ireland as they were in the fifteenth century, before the Reformation was established; suppose we could go to any bishop, priest, or member of the English and Irish Church in that age, and ask him to show us the creeds of his Church, the authorized statement of the articles of the Catholic faith, as held by his Church, what would such priest, or bishop, or layman have shown us? He would have handed us "the Apostles' Creed," "the Nicene Creed," and "the Athanasian Creed." If we go now to any bishop, priest, or layman of the English and Irish Church, and ask him the same question, *he hands us still the same creeds*. But, if we go to a Roman Catholic, in England or Ireland now, and ask him to show

* Ego Athanasium non defendo..... ubi cognovi quando Deo placuit juste vos illum condemnasse: mox consensum meum commodavi sententiis vestris; literas adiuseque super nomine ejus, id est, de damnatione ipsius, per fratrem nostrum Fortunatianum dedi perferandas ad imperatorem nostrum Constantium. Itaque amito Athanasio, super quo statua omnium vestrum a me cum sede apostolica suscipienda sunt; dico me cum omnibus vobis et cum universis episcopis orientalibus seu per universas provincias pacem et unitatem habere. Lab. and Coss. Gen. Con. vol. 2, col. 751, Ed. Par. 1672.

† The eastern bishops had fallen into Arianism *first*: when the Latin or western bishops fell *too*—then was the period of darkness.